## SIX COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS: 2009 CDBG RATING AND RANKING CRITERIA

	Applicant:	Score	Requested	CDBG \$'s	Ranking:		of		Score:	/58
1	Capacity to Cary Out The Grant: Applicant's capacity to		Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	_		
	administer grant; project manager completed in contract		5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	0 points			
	period (1 point); compliance with regulations/laws (2		_	1	_		_			
	points); (First time grantee: default is 2.5 points) Possible 5	;								
	points									
2	Job Creation: Estimated number of permanent new jobs		>25 jobs	15-24 Jobs	10-14 Jobs	1-9 Jobs				
	project will create or number of jobs retained that would be		8 points	6 points	4 points	2 points				
	lost without this project									
3	LMI Housing Stock: Number of units constructed,		>10 units	5-10 Units	1-5 Units					
	rehabilitated, or made accessible to LMI residents		10 points	9 points	8 points					
4	Affordable Housing Plan: Has jurisdiction addressed		Yes	No						
	moderate income housing in its general plan as required		2 points	0 points						
	by HB/295/SB60?									
4a	Does this project implement moderate income housing		Yes	No						
	elements identified in the affordable housing plan?		2 points	0 points						
	(applicant is required to submit their latest plan along with									
	documentation of how project addresses an issue									
	identified in the plan)				_	•	1			
5	Extent of Poverty: Percent of persons considered LMI		> 80%	71%-80%	1	56%-60%	51%-55%			
	benefiting from project. (According to the Census/Survey)		4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point	0 points	_		
6	Local Leveraged Funds: How many dollars is each		\$401-500	\$301-\$400	\$201-	\$101-\$200	\$1-\$100			
	person in the community committing? (Local funds+		5 points	4 points	1	2 points	1 point			
	population)				points			_		
7	Other Leveraged Funds: Percentage of "other" non-		>50%	40%	30%	20%	10%			
	CDBG funds invested in total project	ļ	5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point	_		
			Architect/	Designated	Well-	Funding	Funding in	CDBG		
8	Project Maturity: Detailed engineer's cost estimate;		Engineer	Project	defined	Applied Not	Place	Sole		
Ü	confirmed/designated, project manager, specific/detailed		selected	Manager	Scope	Committed	2 points	Funding		
	scope of work; secured funding (possible 5 points)	-	1 point	1 point	1 point	1 point		2 points		
9	Quality Growth Principles: Has jurisdiction demonstrated		Yes	No						
	their desire to improve planning using quality growth		1 point	0 points						
	principles?	-			1	I		-		
10	Infrastructure Development/Improvement: i.e.		Water	Sewer/Storm		Other Public	Street/	Recreation		
	expansion of basic infrastructure (water sewer) or other		6 points	Drainage	Health/	Facilities	Sidewalks	Facilities		
	physical infrastructure (libraries, fire stations, parks,			5 points	Safety	3 points	2 points	1 point		
	community center etc.) to create suitable living				4 points					
	environments for the persons in a community.	-	1000		2404 2000	11111 2001				
11	Jurisdictions Property Tax Rate: Communities that		>40%	31%-40%	21%-30%	11%-20%	<10%			
	maintain an already high tax burden will be given higher		5 points	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point			
	points for this category (applicants tax rate									
	+ceiling=percent ceiling)									